Abstract

While studying Florence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, I was particularly interested in the indigenous form of humanism that flourished there in the fourteenth century. This period witnessed the growth of this ‘civic humanism’; inspired by the values of Antiquity: Cicero, and later Petrarch, being the figureheads of this ideology. I noted in the course of my readings that some scholars had drawn allusions to the concurrent rise of this peculiarly Florentine branch of humanism, and the growing power and influence of the Medici family, inching towards hegemony. The proponents of this ideology preached the virtue of participating in civic life, and claimed that anyone, regardless of social class, could play an active role in bettering their city, and denounced the autocratic governments of other Italian city-states as tyrannical. I found it extremely curious that such an ideology could exist alongside what must have seemed an incontrovertible reality; the concentrating of power into the hands of one family.

Bearing this in mind, the central question of my essay posited the theory that, far from the simultaneous rise of civic humanism and the Medici fortunes being implausible, the former may have in fact made the latter possible. Cosimo de Medici’s support of many noted humanist scholars ensured that he was constantly lauded as highly committed to the Florentine republican ideal, even as he tightened his control on government councils.

The essay concludes that the cunning of the Medici in utilising civic humanism inevitably rendered the ideology toothless. The link that the Florentine humanists made between scholastic culture, active citizenship and good governance is one that can be found in many instances, even in modern times, and for this reason the intertwining of the fates of Florentine civic humanism and the Medici family is of great interest to me.
Civic humanism in the hands of the Medici, 1434-1492

‘True liberty [consists of] not having to fear violence or injury from any man, and for the citizens to be able to enjoy equality of the law and a government that is equally accessible to all’

Leonardo Bruni, Florentine Chancellor and Civic Humanist

The early Florentine Renaissance was once called the Age of the Medici, after the Florentine first family most associated with the cultural flowering of that era. The city on the Arno has not enjoyed unstinting praise, however, and academics have criticised this characterisation of Florence as the bedrock of the Renaissance thinking, alternatively describing it as a ‘narrowing, bellicose, mercantilist oligarchy lumbering towards personal rule-then takes on the role of a populist utopia’.

Humanism in this essay is defined as a way of thinking which leaves room for humanity by respecting the will-the conscious or even the potentially unconscious-will of groups or individuals. A departure from the medieval preoccupation with the divine and a fascination with the corporeal aspects of humanity: life stories, individual experiences. Renaissance painters and sculptors created human figures and philosophers exclaimed ‘What a great miracle is man!’ (magnum miraculum est homo). The Italian Renaissance humanists of this period were men of who cultivated the study of grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, and moral philosophy. Eugenio Garin notes that ‘possession of ancient languages coupled with a thorough grounding in the scientific and philosophical disciplines was all but indispensible’. Proficiency in these disciplines was fused with a fervent interest in the classical world. It was the humanist who most perfectly expressed ‘the general tendency of the age to attach the greatest importance to classical studies, and to consider classical antiquity as the common standard and model by which to guide all cultural activities’. Nicholas of Cusa wrote of the return to classical antiquity in 1433: “We see that all minds today, even the greatest scholars

---

in all the liberal and mechanical arts, seek out ancient things, and with great eagerness, as if one could hope that an entire cycle was about to come to a close (ac si totius revolutionis circulus proximo completri speraretur)” 8.

The juxtaposition of an oligarchic government with a republican ideology profoundly influenced the movement that was ‘civic humanism’, and it must be remembered that these were probably stronger in Florence than in any other Italian city. Baron identified the lonely stand of Florence against the territorial aggression of Milan under the Visconti as a crucial catalyst in giving rise to the uniquely Florentine ‘civic’ humanism. This stance imbied the Florentines with a heady sense of their own destiny as the pre-eminent power in Tuscany 9, compelling them to engage in rigorous self-analysis that affirmed the values for which they were fighting: freedom of speech, the equality of all citizens before the law, and the right to self government—what would become the hallmarks of modern democracy 10. Conversely, Milan in particular had to be characterised as oppressive, tyrannical and imperialist. It may be suggested, in line with prevailing historical opinion, that civic humanism arguably reached its zenith during the chancellorship of Leonardo Bruni from 1427 until his death in 1444. Bruni retained his government post through the exile of the Medici in October 1433, perhaps due to his great renown as a humanist 11. Baron regarded Bruni as something of an avatar of republican freedom 12, and maintains in his work that Bruni was the first chancellor for whom the ‘political-civic direction of interest’ was ‘determining’ for his humanism. It is possible to draw a line here under the literary humanism of the fourteenth century, and the birth of the civic humanism of the fifteenth 13. This timeframe also traces the dying days of the republic, and the morphing of Florence into a principality in all but name.

The ‘Laudatio’ of the young Leonardo Bruni best illustrates this trend: his argument that Florence, more than any other Italian state, could claim to be the heir of ancient Rome. The secret of Rome’s greatness had been republican freedom, which was bequeathed to the colony on the Arno, founded as it was in the age of pure Roman republicanism before the despotism of the emperors had laid waste to civic freedom—a rather convenient interpretation

11 Martines, Florentine Humanists, 166.
13 Jerrold E. Seigel, “Civic Humanism” or Ciceronian Rhetoric? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni’, Past and Present 34, (1966). 4
of events. This thesis necessarily threw up the premise that in furthering her own territorial acquisition, Florence was due everything which had once been the property of republican Rome, as her inheritance. Leonardo Bruni wrote in his *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* that ‘to you, men of Florence, belongs dominion over all the earth by a kind of hereditary right, a kind of paternal inheritance’. Advocates of civic humanism view this as the moment where civic humanism became the dominant cultural ideal of the Florentine ruling classes.

A combination of factors gave rise to the peculiarly Florentine branch of this movement, which had evolved beyond the Petrarchian branch of humanism that had first posited the theory that involvement in civic life did not detract from, but rather enhanced, one’s scholastic career. Baron opines that it was the habit of linking the *vita activa* with the *vita politica*, rather than the mere acceptance of a need for a *vita activa*, that set apart Florentine thought from that of the rest of Italy in the early Quattrocento. The key role model for this ideal was Cicero, and the earlier stages of contemplative and scholarly humanism, as practiced by Petrarch. His obsessive promotion of Cicero greatly contributed to the growth of civic republicanism in Florence.

The first part of this essay attempts to address a glaring contradiction in the thesis of Hans Baron, which has been raised by several historians. Baron builds upon the premise that the Florentine republican tradition owed much of its vitality to the rich intellectual tradition of the humanists, who led a revival in the classical world. But how could the zenith of Florentine humanist culture, the celebrated revival of the ideas of Antiquity and the birth of a modern ideology occur—and thrive—alongside the morphing of the republic into a principality in all but name? How could this civic humanist ideology, which was such a resilient manifestation of Florence’s resistance to what was consistently dubbed ‘tyranny’ by Baron,
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14 Seigel, “‘Civic Humanism’ or Ciceronian Rhetoric, 5.
18 Seigel, “‘Civic Humanism’ or Ciceronian Rhetoric?”, 5.
19 Baron, ‘Leon Battista Alberti as an Heir and Critic of Florentine Civic Humanism’ in *Florentine Civic Humanism* vol. 1, 258.
echoing the language used by the Florentine humanists themselves\textsuperscript{21}, occur alongside the creep towards Medici hegemony?

The answer put forward from some historians is that there was no contradiction between the ideals of civic humanism and support for the Medici regime\textsuperscript{22}. The paradox of the two-faced regime that developed post-1382 was born from a clash of two opposing republican ideologies. Alison Brown draws connections between the Roman and Florentine republics, not only in their positive qualities, but also how they both nurtured the seeds of their own destruction. Through patronage, public shows, financial manipulation and the slow but remorseless transformation of the constitution, republican Florence met the same death as republican Rome\textsuperscript{23}.

Najemy’s work on this subject also supports the theory that there was no contradiction in the co-existence of consensus and elitism, for the former made the latter possible\textsuperscript{24}. He plots the trajectory of Florentine consensus politics, noting the burgeoning of those eligible for political office after the reforms of the fleeting Ciompi government of 1378-82\textsuperscript{25}. He posits a theory he calls ‘dutiful passivity’, claiming that many upper-class Florentines waited patiently for the honour of high office to be visited upon them from that powers that be, developing essentially a passive attitude to their own identity and participation in politics\textsuperscript{26}. Najemy, like Baron, regards Leonardo Bruni, the most influential of all the Medici chancellors, as having helped to formalize and refine the victorious oligarchic republicanism through the prism of civic humanism\textsuperscript{27}.

This change occurred in the post-Ciompi era after 1382, where rigorous safeguards were put in place to ensure an equal footing in the administration. There were open nominations and the inclusion of thousands of names in the \textit{borse} for political office. This vigorous old guild republicanism was therefore rooted in wide participation across government councils and frequent rotation of office to ensure maximum participation, with citizens assuming the duties office according to the established rights of their class. Christifano Spini claimed in 1408 that

\textsuperscript{21} In Baron’s view, this was the only alternative to republican virtue. It has been noted that this term has been used so often by Baron, as a pejorative term for any kind of monarchical system, that it has lost any precise significance. See Gundersheimer, ‘Hans Baron’s Renaissance Humanism’, 142-144.
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the regime had never been so stable, ‘because all who merit it belong to it’. This era saw the trebling (or even the quadrupling) of those eligible for political office. This, according to Najemy, contributed substantially to the willingness of the guilds to ‘merge their political identities into the theoretical homogeneity of individual equality’. Public office-holding under the Medici faction was the child of this movement, a younger republican ideology which undermined the legitimacy of communal corporate politics. Posts were awarded as a reward from one’s betters for loyal service. This policy was made palatable through the prism of civic humanism, where supporters of the old guild republicanism rationalised their acquiescence to a political oligarchy as something of a ‘consolation prize’ for relinquishing the chance for real and meaningful engagement in the governing of their city. External factors may have also played a part; the near permanent state of war and the frequency of the convening restricted membership emergency committees (balie) meant that citizens were prepared to sacrifice political rights for the greater good of the city.

Eugenio Garin, a contemporary of Hans Baron, had difficulty reconciling the republican rhetoric of Bruni (as well that of as subsequent chancellors like Marsuppini (1444-1453) and della Scala (1465-1497)) with their open collaboration with the Medici. Garin dated the ‘last heroic age of Florentine humanism’ to the chancellorship of Coluccio Salutati (1375-1406), recognising that Bruni’s relationship with the Medici regime made it difficult to extend this era to his lengthy chancellorship. Bruni himself, however, contributed to an already existing debate which qualified his position in a very subtle way. He argued that virtue depended on the presence of political liberty. Drawing on Antiquity in true humanist fashion, he maintained that when Roman citizens renounced their liberty, their virtue also passed away. In many of his important works- e.g. *Oratio in funere Ioannis Stroze, Storia di Firenze*-Bruni proposed that this symbiotic relationship could be seen in contemporary Florence: between culture and political freedom. Bruni claimed that ‘virtue, nobility, and genius can only flourish among politically free people’.

The simplicity of this argument is appealing; where virtue, nobility, and genius exist, political liberty must correspondingly be present. Hankins wrote that Bruni, in his history of Florence,
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‘worked out an entire theory of historical development which identified the highest moments of human culture with its moments of greatest political freedom: Periclean Athens, late republican Rome, and the Florentine republic’. The inclusion of Athens here is symptomatic of the renewal of interest in classical Greek philosophy in the early 15th century after the fall of Constantinople and the influx of highly acclaimed Byzantine scholars who taught classical Greek philosophy at the Florentine Studio. This stance was strongly affirmed by his Florentine humanist contemporaries, who evaluated representatives of imperial and republican government by cultural, rather than political standards. The core of this argument essentially reinforced the idea that the legitimacy of any government, monarchical, oligarchic, or popular, could be defended or undermined by its presence or lack of intellectual vitality. This is pertinent to our discussion because the outpouring of literary, artistic, architectural, and philosophical works during this period was owed largely to the patronage of the elite families, with the Medici being the most generous. Humanists dedicated over forty translations and original works to Cosimo, making him one of Renaissance Italy’s foremost literary patrons. This provided a persuasive justification for Cosimo’s growing influence; even as he was consolidating his hegemony in government councils, works praising his dedication to the Florentine republican ideal were being proliferated. The inconsistencies of civic humanism’s genuine social and political context neither detracted from its influence, nor hindered its propagandistic power. It did not mirror Florentine society as it actually was, but how it could be.

If we accept the previous argument, then the second point of this essay must ask whether the Baronian thesis can in fact be turned on its head. Rather than being classed the defenders of liberty and the champions of republicanism, the humanists were employed as the ideologues of the oligarchic elite, and incredibly effective ideologues at that, happy to act as spokesmen for princely governments for personal and financial reasons. It may thus also be argued that

36 The crux of the matter here was drawn from the debate on the relative quality and quantity of Roman liberal studies under the rule of Caesar. Poggio was one of the humanists who promoted this theory, finding the most authoritative condemnation of Caesar in the works of Tacitus, who first argued that the ‘brilliant minds’ of Rome disappeared under the advent of Caesar- Jurdievic, ‘Civic Humanism’, 1002.
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41 See also Garin (ed), Renaissance Characters, 14.
there was no contradiction between the rise of the Medici and the simultaneous flourishing of civic humanist ideology; rather, their standing as patrons of intellectuals was utilised to justify and legitimise Medici power\textsuperscript{42}. Some humanists, most famously Francesco Filelfo, became anti-Medicean polemists in the employ of northern despots, which suggests that their opposition to the Medici had little to do with ideological distaste for one-man rule\textsuperscript{43}. Certainly the much-lauded Leonardo Bruni, in his \textit{Laudatio Florentinae urbis}, entices the readers with a history celebrating Florence’s great deeds\textsuperscript{44}. But it should not be forgotten that he was later granted Florentine citizenship and a tax privilege in perpetuity in return for his services as an official historian\textsuperscript{45}.

This façade, if indeed that is what it was, was carefully maintained across all quarters. When the Commune decided to appoint a new professor in 1455, they did so: ‘since the whole glory and magnificence of the city consists in having wise, well-lettered and worthy citizens who lead to an increase in the glory and standing of the city’. They continued ‘there are now very many young men who would most eagerly wish to study letters if any learned and eloquent men were invited to teach publicly in Florence’-an indication of how much the political prestige of Florence was tied up in this question\textsuperscript{46}.

Bruni himself, the greatest propagator of mass civic and political participation, was a leading member of the Florentine patriciate\textsuperscript{47}. Martines maintains that however one approaches the humanists, one finds that they tend to be-like their disciples, friends, associates in office, and relatives by marriage-recruited from the ruling classes\textsuperscript{48}. This was a marked departure from the early humanism of Petrarch; where before the ideals of Franciscan poverty had been embraced, the fourteenth century humanists turned to an appreciation of wealth as a foundation for the exercise of certain kinds of civic virtue\textsuperscript{49}.

To adopt this theory on its face may be to do a disservice to the astuteness of the circle of humanists that surrounded the Medici family-if we accept that certain humanists were nothing more than the glorified civil servants in the thrall of an ever more restrictive regime, could it also be argued that others accepted this role and used their closeness to the leading
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Medici as a subtle means of steering government (and increasingly, Medici) policy? This has indeed been postulated by some historians, most notably Alison Brown. Brown mentions an example of a letter written by Francesco Filelfo to Cosimo de’ Medici, urging him to restore exiles to their patria. Filelfo tells Cosimo ‘then you will most certainly, with no opposition, be called princeps of the republic and Pater Patriae, then all will honour you, all admire you’\(^{50}\). This advice was not acted upon by Cosimo, but it clearly demonstrates the humanist drawing upon his classical knowledge to persuade a politician to embark upon a particular course. Even more crucial is the title of Pater Patriae being bestowed upon Cosimo some twenty four years before it formally adorned his tomb\(^{51}\). However, Brown qualifies this by claiming that this title was more of a reflection of the desire of the humanists to forge links between Quattrocento Florence and classical antiquity than it was a direct statement of admiration for Cosimo\(^{52}\). Indeed, while his political genius was widely acknowledged, his academic knowledge has been doubted by historians. Cosimo’s scholasticism has been described as meagre; because of his lack of formal humanist education he ‘saw intellectual changes only in their dimmest outline’\(^{53}\). Historians have occasionally sniped that scholars so often praised the temperance and prudence of Cosimo because they were so reluctant to praise his Latin or Greek\(^{54}\), although this is far from undisputed\(^{55}\). Some have highlighted the uncertainty that remains here, as many of the sources of this era were eulogies dedicated to Cosimo that extolled his virtues, so his aptitude for classical Latin and other humanist disciplines remains in doubt\(^{56}\).

Another complicating factor was the habit that the humanists had of writing advice books on diplomacy and other subjects for princes and courtiers. Was this some kind of tacit admission of their fitness to rule, despite Bruni’s assertion that a popular regime is ‘the only legitimate’ one?\(^{57}\) While there are several reasons why one might doubt that the humanists, particularly the chancellors, were persons of integrity and possessed of an independent political frame of mind in Medicean Florence, this did not prevent them from exercising a very great influence on Florence and beyond. The Medici evidently found it advisable not to sweep away the

\(^{50}\) Brown, *The Medici in Florence*, 8.
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apparatus of consensus politics as their influence grew, precisely because the republican ethos was so vital, setting Florence apart from other Italian city-states, most notably Milan under the Visconti. After the death of Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1492, his sons fled Florence from a plot by an anti-Medici faction led by the Pazzi family that some have depicted as a revolt informed by radical republican thought. Lorenzo’s death marked, for some, the end of the Florentine Golden Age. The humanist intellectual underpinning of Medici power was amply demonstrated under Lorenzo’s rule. A recipient of a thoroughly refined humanistic education, evidenced by his extensive literary output and voluminous correspondence, Lorenzo’s relationship with the humanists of his time was a markedly different one to that of his grandfather Cosimo. Garin remarks on Lorenzo keeping Ficino around his palace, ‘[making] use of him not only to add brilliance to his house, but also doubtless for subtle reasons of political propaganda’. Martines subscribes to the opinion of Garin, that the creeping signorial domination: ‘extinguished the ardour of political struggle, destroyed the intense palpitation of the life of the city-state. In place of the ideal respublica as a cooperative community, as a true society, even if a restricted one, we get Caeser, who banishes everyone from political life and transforms the existing culture—the expression, instrument, and program of a class arrived into riches and power—into an elegant ornament of court, or into a desperate flight from the world—an undoubted nod to the rise of Neoplatonism in the face of unassailable Medici hegemony at the end of the Quattrocento. This is perhaps coincidental, as we know less of the ideological underpinnings of Medici rule in the time of Cosimo’s political career. The accounts are generally of electoral and political procedural subversion, as well as factional politics. It can at least be said that republican spirit in Florence had not been totally crushed and forgotten in 1400s given the revival that it enjoyed at the end of the
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century; however it is perhaps significant that it looks to contemporary Venice for inspiration rather than classical Rome\textsuperscript{65}.

The new type of chancellor, still ostensibly a humanist, lost his political influence during the middle decades of the fifteenth century and became ‘a solemnly ornamental figure like [the old] Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), or a haughty administrator like Bartolomeo Scala (1430-1497)\textsuperscript{66}. This dynasty of watchdogs of the Florentine republican tradition found themselves outmatched by the dynasty which had originally propelled them to such heights. Where the earlier generation had struck a balance between the \textit{vita contemplativa} and the \textit{vita activa} in their own lives, the slow generational outmanoeuvring orchestrated by the Medici rendered the humanists unable to survive without the sustenance that was their patronage and their favour. By the time Poliziano, acting as tutor to the children of Lorenzo, comes into the fray, the influence of the humanists is on the wane: ‘he lives and works in a time when the new [humanistic] culture is no longer an operative force in the city, in that very Florence of humanistic merchants and chancellors, now transformed into mere courtiers and professors, often courtier-professors’\textsuperscript{67}. Political reflection among the humanists had been pushed to the limits of intellectual activity\textsuperscript{68}.

It would be overly simplistic to lay the blame for the waning of humanist influence at the feet of the House of Medici, just as it would be false to credit the humanists, their oratories and their pens, with the Medici takeover during the latter half of the Quattrocento. Civic humanism promoted values that we could now regard as modern: the positive image of the human being and the affirmation of human activity, an orientation towards the future, and the belief in equality and liberty\textsuperscript{69}. But their actions and their intellectual endeavours sometimes meant that they were taken advantage of by the ruling class, and some consciously and willingly subverted the doctrine that they preached even as they openly proclaimed that there was no such thing as a ruling elite. Nevertheless, the republican institutions and traditions did actually limit the power of the Medici, especially in comparison to other Italian \textit{signori}\textsuperscript{70}.

The adoption of civic humanist language forced the ruling faction to grant some form of
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political expression to the *popolo*, making the authority of Cosimo entirely different to that of a despot\textsuperscript{71}. In this way, civic humanism could be regarded as the first discourse that realised the emancipatory potential of modern political thought which brings us back finally to the thesis of Baron in the mid-twentieth century and even Burckhardt in the nineteenth century, albeit very much nuanced and qualified. While Baron may have been mistaken to regard the Florentine humanists as ardent republicans, he captured their most important contribution to modern ideology: true personal distinction in the civic life had to include a commitment to serving one’s community, and scholarship and learning must be brought to bear on cultivating the virtues necessary for the maintenance of civilised society\textsuperscript{72}.

**Bibliography**

- Baron, Hans, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni: Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature* (Chicago, 1968),
- Baron, Hans, *In Search of Florentine Civic Humanism: Essays on the Transition from Medieval to Modern Thought* (vol. 1), (Princeton, 1988),
- Black, Jane, *Absolutism in Renaissance Milan* [electronic resource] plenitude of power under the Visconti and the Sforza, 1329-1535 (Oxford, 2009),

● Hankins, James (ed), *Renaissance Civic Humanism: Reappraisals and Reflections* (Cambridge, 2000),
● Lonergan, Corinna Salvadori, (ed.), *Lorenzo de' Medici: Selected Writings* (Dublin, 1992)
● Najemy, John M., *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics*, (Chapel Hill, 1992),
● Runciman, Steven, *The Fall of Constantinople 1453* (London, 1965),
● Seigel, Jerrold E., “Civic Humanism” or Ciceronian Rhetoric? The Culture of Petrarch and Bruni’, *Past and Present* 34, (1966),

**Websites**
● http://renaissance.academic.ru/